

### REMARKS

In the Action, claims 13-19, 25 and 26 are rejected. In response, claims 13, 17, 25 and 26 are amended. The pending claims in this application are claims 13-19, 25 and 26, with claims 13, 17, 25 and 26 being independent.

The claims are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement, and paragraph 2 for being indefinite. For example, independent claim 13 is amended to clarify that R<sub>2</sub> is a hydrocarbon chain having 2 to 22 carbon atoms which is saturated or unsaturated and having 1 to 4 ethylenic unsaturations. Claim 13 does not require that R<sub>2</sub> has 1 to 4 ethylenic unsaturated groups. Instead, claim 13 states that R<sub>2</sub> can be saturated or unsaturated and that when R<sub>2</sub> is unsaturated, R<sub>2</sub> can have from 1 to 4 ethylenic unsaturated groups. The reference to 1 to 4 unsaturated groups in claim 13 refers only to R<sub>2</sub> when R<sub>2</sub> is unsaturated. As amended, claim 13 is in proper form. Claim 25 is amended in a similar manner to overcome this rejection.

Independent claim 17 is amended to correct clerical errors in the claim as noted in the Action. Specifically, the primary alcohols are defined as being 10,19 octacosadiene and 10,19,22 octacosatriene. These amendments are consistent with the dienoic acid and trienoic acid recited in claim 17. These amendments are consistent with the Examples in the specification. Accordingly, these amendments are submitted to overcome the rejection.

The specification is also amended to be consistent with the claims and to recite the specific compounds. The amendments to the specification are also supported by the Examples in the specification as originally filed and the original claims of the international application. In particular, see original claim 17 of the international application reciting the primary alcohols and C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> alkyl ester of the acids. Accordingly, the amendment to the specification does not introduce new matter.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected as allegedly not being enabled by the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the method of claims 25 and 26 is enabled

to one of ordinary skill in the art based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan, the specification and the prior references. The alternative uses or properties of the claimed compounds as disclosed in the specification do not render the specification inoperative for the claimed method. The alternative uses are not being claimed and have no bearing on the enablement of the claimed method. Simply because alternative methods or uses are disclosed in the specification but not claimed, does not establish that the methods of claims 25 and 26 are not enabled.

The claimed method is enabled by the specification with a reasonable expectation of success based on the common knowledge by one of ordinary skill in the art. The specification clearly discloses the compounds of the invention and the methods of preparing the compounds. Furthermore, the activity of the compounds for the treatment of hypercholesterolaemia is disclosed. For example, page 7 of the specification, last full paragraph, discloses that the compounds of the invention have improved activity compared to the corresponding polycosanols and polycosanoic acids. Accordingly, the claims are enabled by the specification as originally filed.

In view of these amendments and the above comments, the claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Garrett V. Davis  
Reg. No. 32,023

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: Aug 27, 2008